REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested that the steps of the independent claims be identified in the drawings; rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention; and rejected claims 1-8 and 10-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over GRABER et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,769).

By way of this amendment claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 15, 16, 24, 26, 42 and 46 have been amended to improve form. New claim 47 has been added to further clarify the scope of the present invention. Accordingly, claims 1-8 and 10-47 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Examiner requested that Applicants identify each of the steps of the independent claims in the drawings in accordance with Rule 1.83a and 1.75d(1). Applicants continue to consider the application and associated drawings to provide clear support with respect to the elements of the independent claims. Nonetheless, a detailed identification of exemplary drawing elements associated with independent claims 1, 24, 26, 27, 31, 38, 39, and 46 is set forth below in Appendix A, where element number designations are provided following each claim element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending objection.

Claim 2 has rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point our and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention. More specifically, the Examiner indicates that there

is no antecedent basis for "original URL links." Accordingly, Applicants have amended

claim 2 to provide a proper antecedent basis for the objected to term. In view of these

amendments, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 and 10-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over GRABER et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method for processing a request at a

first server to form a modified request that is directed to a second server, the first and

second servers being coupled to a network. The method includes receiving the request

from a requestor. An initial hostname portion of the request associated with a network

address of the first server is identified. A replacement hostname portion for the request is

retrieved from storage associated with the server, where the replacement hostname

portion is associated with a network address of the second server. The initial hostname

portion is replaced with the replacement hostname portion to form the modified request.

The modified request is forwarded to the second server using the replacement hostname

portion. Information associated with the modified request is received from the second

server. The received information is modified to associate the received information with

the first server.

Applicants submit that GRABER et al. fails to disclose or suggest the

combination of features recited in Applicants' claim 1, as amended, as required by 35

U.S.C. § 103(a).

For example, GRABER et al. does not disclose or suggest the retrieving a

replacement *hostname* portion from storage associated with the first server, where the

replacement hostname portion is associated with a network address of the second server,

and replacing the initial *hostname* portion with the replacement *hostname* portion to form

a modified request. The Examiner relied upon col. 7, lines 49-52 for allegedly disclosing

retrieving a replacement hostname portion from a storage associated with the first server

(Office Action, pg. 3). Applicants respectfully submit that this section of GRABER et al.

does not disclose or suggest the hostname retrieval feature of claim 1 recited above.

At col. 7, line 49-52, GRABER et al. discloses:

> In this step, the complete destination URL which was passed to the OLS web
> server, 142 when the user was directed from the co-marketer site 122a, 122b,
> 122c to OLS site 128 is retrieved by OLS web server 142...

This section of GRABER et al. discloses only using information received in a

URL from a requesting co-marketer web site to identify the co-marketer related to the

request. This section of GRABER et al. does not disclose retrieving a replacement

hostname portion to replace the hostname portion of the request. On the contrary, only

relative destination or appended UNIX symbolic link information is modified in the URL

of GRABER et al. (see e.g., col. 3, lines 15-19).

As is understood in the art, the term hostname or host name refers specifically to

the textual name associated with a resource's Internet Protocol (IP) address. A URL

including a properly formed hostname may be mapped by a domain name service (DNS)

to an associated IP address. GRABER et al. clearly fails to disclose or suggest retrieving

a replacement hostname portion associated with a network address of a second server.

Rather, a received URL is merely modified to append co-marketer identification

information to a destination portion (not a hostname portion) of the received URL. The

hostname portion of all URLs remains unchanged. In this way, the relative addressing

and UNIX symbolic links may be propagated through potential links.

In GRABER et al., a user initially accesses a co-marketer web site (e.g., www.abcd.com) which then directs the user to an online service web site using a specific hyperlink having a URL of a specific format (e.g., www.ols.com\cm1\index.html), indicating the identity of the referring co-marketer. As disclosed at col. 5, lines 36-45, this URL has two portions, a first portion (e.g., www.ols.com) associated with the OLS site and a second portion (e.g., \cm1\index.htrml) indicating the relational resource filename (index.html) and a UNIX symbolic link (cm1) indicative of the co-marketer. In this manner, requests received via the URL indicate both the resource the user desires to view as well as an indication as to the identity of the co-marketer. The second portion of the URL does *not* include a replacement hostname or relate to the hostname of the resource in any manner. The hostname of the received URL and the hostname of the URL are the same (e.g., www.ols.com, in this instance). In fact, GRABER et al. specifically teaches away from implementing multiple hostnames (e.g., web sites) at col. 10, lines 39-49. .

This section of GRABER et al. indicates that the use of relative URL addressing may be used to move between pages in a user's current directory or to a subdirectory located below the user's current directory. However, relative URL addressing does not permit a user to move between different web sites or to web pages above outside of a current web page's directory and maintain the UNIX symbolic link information associated with a current URL and necessary for the system of GRABER et al. to function.

Once a user has reached the OLS site, subsequent links in the resource are then modified to reflect the identity of the co-marketer referring the user to the site. In this

manner, the format of the URLs used to access all www.OLS.com resources indicates to

OLS that the received request is received based on a referral from www.abcd.com.

Essentially, the system of GRABER et al. operates to ensure that an indication of

a co-marketer's identity is appended to every possible URL associated with the OLS web

site. However, once an initial referral is made, the co-marketer is no longer directly

included in individual user requests or transactions. Contrary to GRABER et al., the

system of claim 1 requires that the first server be continually involved in requests for

resources associated with the second server (i.e., receiving information associated with

the modified request from the second server).

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable

over GRABER et al.

Claims 2-8, 10-23, and 47 depend from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit

that these claims are patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above

with respect to claim 1. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or

suggested by GRABER et al.

For example, claim 15 recites the request further including at least a port number,

and retrieving the replacement hostname portion from storage associated with the first

server based on at least the port number and the initial hostname portion. Additionally,

claim 16 recites retrieving the replacement hostname portion from storage based on at

least the port number and a requestor or session identifier. Also, claim 17 recites

retrieving the replacement hostname portion from storage based on a host variable

provided with the request. Applicants submit that since GRABER et al. does not disclose

retrieving the replacement *hostname* portion from *storage* associated with a first server,

GRABER et al. cannot disclose the features of claims 15-17. The Examiner does not

specifically address the features of claims 15-17 in the Office Action and does not

indicate a portion of GRABER et al. allegedly disclosing the claimed features.

Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established with respect to

claims 15-17. For at least these additional reasons, Applicants submit that claims 15-17

are patentable over GRABER et al.

Claims 18-20 depend from claim 17. Therefore, Applicants submit that these

claims are patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with

respect to claim 17.

Regarding independent claims 24, 26, 27, 31, 38, 39, and 46, the Examiner

indicates at page 5 of the Office Action that these claims are broader than claims 1-8 and

10-23. The Examiner then indicates that claims 24, 26, 27, 31, 38, 39, and 46 therefore

do not define above the invention claimed in claims 1-8 and 10-23 and are therefore

rejected under GRABER et al. for the same reasons as claims 1-8 and 10-23. Applicants

continue to respectfully disagree.

For example, claim 24, as amended, recites a method for modifying a markup

language document to facilitate access to other resources residing on remote servers

through an intermediate server. The method includes receiving, at the intermediate

server, the markup language document including at least one original link to another

resource. The at least one original link of the markup language document is modified to

link to the intermediary server, to form a modified markup language document having at

least one modified link, where the modified link is associated with the resource and the

intermediary server. The modified markup language document is forwarded to a requestor.

No indication is provided where any of the claim elements recited in claim 24 may be found in the cited GRABER et al. reference. More specifically, the Examiner fails to indicate where GRABER et al. discloses or fairly suggests modifying an original link in a markup language document to link to the *intermediary server.* The system of GRABER et al. fails to disclose or suggest receiving, at an intermediate server, a markup language document including at least one original link to another resource and modifying the at least one original link of the markup language document to link to the intermediary server, to form a modified markup language document having at least one modified link, where the modified link is associated with the resource and the *intermediary server.* As discussed in detail above, GRABER et al. described a system wherein URLs are modified to include co-marketer identification information. Such modifications are not equivalent to and do not suggest the features of claim 24. Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 has not been made. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 24 is patentable over GRABER et al.

Claims 25 depends from claim 24. Accordingly, claim 25 is patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 24, Independent claims 26, 27, 31, 38, 39 and 46 recite features similar to features recited above with respect to claim 24. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 26, 27, 31, 38, 39 and 46 are patentable over GRABER et al for reasons similar to reasons given above with respect to claim 24. Moreover, these claims recite additional features not disclosed or suggested by GRABER et al.

For example, claim 39 recites a method for modifying Universal Resource Locators (URLs) in a browser viewable document. The method includes: identifying a URL in the browser viewable document; determining whether the URL includes an initial hostname; determining whether the URL is associated with a secure request; modifying the initial hostname of the URL in a first manner when it is determined that the URL includes the initial hostname and that the URL is not associated with a secure request; and modifying the initial hostname of the URL in a second manner when it is determined that the URL includes the initial hostname and that the URL is associated with a secure request, the second manner being different from the first manner.

No indication is provided where any of the claim elements recited in claim 39 may be found in the cited GRABER et al. reference. More specifically, the Examiner fails to indicate where GRABER et al. discloses or fairly suggests modifying the initial hostname of the URL in a first manner when it is determined that the URL includes the initial hostname and that the URL is not associated with a secure request. Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103 has not been made. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 39 is patentable over GRABER et al.

Claims 28-30 depend from claim 27. Therefore, these claims are patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 27. Claims 32-37 depend from claim 31. Therefore, these claims are patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 31. Claims 40-45 depend from claim 39. Therefore, these claims are patentable over GRABER et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 39.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully

request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of all

claims 1-8 and 10-47.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §

1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the

filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070

and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By:

Robin C. Clark
Registration No. 40,956

Date: February 18, 2005

11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

APPENDIX A

Detailed Listing of Exemplary Drawing Elements relating to Independent Claims

1.   A method for processing a request at a first server (604) to form a modified

request that is directed to a second server (e.g., 608), the first and second servers (604,

608) being coupled to a network, said method comprising:

receiving the request from a requestor (420, 506, pg. 16 lines 1-5, pg. 22, line 29-

pg. 23, line 8);

identifying an initial hostname portion of the request associated with a network

address of the first server (see e.g., 422, pg. 20, lines 26-31);

retrieving a replacement hostname portion for the request from a storage (606)

associated with the first server (604) (526, see pg. 17, lines 24-29, pg. 23, lines 26-30),

wherein the replacement hostname portion is associated with a network address of

the second server (528);

replacing the initial hostname portion with the replacement hostname portion to

form the modified request (530, pg. 17, line 32-pg. 18, line 1);

forwarding the modified request to the second server using the replacement

hostname portion (536);

receiving information associated with the modified request from the second server

(538); and

modifying the received information to associate the received information with the

first server (546).

24.   A method for modifying a markup language document to facilitate access to other resources residing on remote servers through an intermediate server, said method comprising:

receiving, at the intermediate server, the markup language document, the markup language document including at least one original link to another resource (538, 548);

modifying the at least one original link of the markup language document to link to the intermediary server, to form a modified markup language document having at least one modified link, the modified link being associated with the resource and the intermediary server (560, 562); and

forwarding the modified markup language document to a requestor (564).

26.   A computer readable medium including at least computer program code for modifying a browser viewable document to facilitate access to other resources residing on remote servers through an intermediate server, said computer readable medium comprising:

computer program code configured to receive the browser viewable document, the browser viewable document including at least one original link to another resource (538, 548);

computer program code configured to modify the at least one original link of the browser viewable document to link to the intermediary server, to form a modified markup language document having at least one modified link, the modified link being associated with the resource and the intermediary server (560, 562); and

computer program code configured to forward the modified markup language

document to a requestor (564);

27. A method for modifying Universal Resource Locators (URLs) in a browser viewable document, said method comprising:

identifying a URL in the browser viewable document (560, 562);

determining whether the URL includes an initial hostname associated with a resource (560, 562); and

modifying the initial hostname of the URL to a predetermined hostname with the initial hostname being a subdomain to the predetermined hostname (560, 562),

wherein the predetermined hostname is associated with an intermediary server, such that requests associated with the URL are directed to the intermediary server rather than the resource.

31. A method for modifying Universal Resource Locators (URLs) in a browser viewable document, said method comprising:

identifying a URL in the browser viewable document (560);

determining whether the URL includes an initial hostname (560); and

replacing the initial hostname of the URL with a predetermined hostname when it is determined that the URL includes the initial hostname (560).

38. A method for modifying target Universal Resource Locators (URLs) in a browser viewable document being identified by a source URL, said method comprising:

identifying a target URL in the browser viewable document (1002);

determining whether the target URL includes an initial hostname (1004);

determining whether the source URL has an appended hostname or port information associated therewith (1008); and

appending the hostname or port information associated with the source URL to the target URL when it is determined that the target URL does not include the initial hostname and that the source URL has appended hostname or port information associated therewith (1008).

39.   A method for modifying Universal Resource Locators (URLs) in a browser viewable document, said method comprising:

identifying a URL in the browser viewable document (1002);

determining whether the URL includes an initial hostname (1004);

determining whether the URL is associated with a secure request (1006);

modifying the initial hostname of the URL in a first manner when it is determined that the URL includes the initial hostname and that the URL is not associated with a secure request (1008); and

modifying the initial hostname of the URL in a second manner when it is determined that the URL includes the initial hostname and that the URL is associated with a secure request (1014, 1016),

the second manner being different from the first manner.

46.   A method for modifying a markup language document to facilitate access to other markup language documents through an intermediary server, said method comprising:

receiving, at the intermediary server, a first markup language document from a

remote server (538, 548);

locating hostnames within certain predetermined tags of the first markup language

document (1004);

modifying the located hostnames within the first markup language document to

include a hostname associated with the intermediary server, such that requests associated

with the markup language document are directed to the intermediary server rather than

the remote server (1008, 1016).